

I oppose HR 114. I oppose the legislature of Hawaii committing time and resources to this call for a Constitutional Convention. If these areas need be addressed, the elected Members of the US Congress and the provided Federal level procedures are the proper venue. Additionally, I oppose the items themselves as detailed below

Clause (1): The Bill of Rights, promised to critics of the Constitution in the 1788 debates, is an integral part of the foundation establishing the United States. The Rights established by the first ten Amendments were and are so important that changes here alter the very substance of the United States. The US Supreme Court rules on Constitutionality of legislation and does so with an awareness of the current state of the Nation. The interpretation may change but the basic right must remain.

Clause (2): Declaring current legislation a part of the Constitution makes revisions which may be needed or desired in the future very difficult. The Nation and the world are not static. The needs and wants of the people cannot be frozen to a particular time. The US Congress must be allowed to modify, adjust and/or eliminate legislation which no longer represents the needs and desires of the people. Prohibition (Eighteenth Article of Amendment) and its subsequent Repeal (Twenty-first Article of Amendment) clearly shows the fallacy of using an unalterable amendment to address what was, at the time, a current desire. Being unable to modify the restrictions to address problems and changes in attitude with the legislative process made the very difficult action of repeal the only option.

Clause (3): Article I, Section 5 of the Constitution does not, and should not, establish Rules of its Proceedings for either Federal level House of Congress. The Senate establishes its procedures and can modify these procedures if desired. Hawaii, or any other state, has no place in determining how the Senate or House of Representatives conducts business.

Clause (4): The Electoral Collage is an anachronism but in operation, benign. It could be eliminated but not the basis for a Constitutional Convention.

Clause (5): Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution lists only Treaties as requiring the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present. The threshold for Senate Advice and Consent agreement to Appointments is established by procedure or law. [see Clause (3) above]

This Resolution should not receive Committee approval. There are more important and pressing areas for the Hawaii legislature to address. Do not waste time and resources on what are not the needs of Hawaii or the Hawaii legislature's area of governance.

Douglas Beijer
HC 1 Box 239
Kaunakakai, HI 96748
(808) 553-8343 Voice/FAX

HCR 114 NO!

HCR 114 NO!

Cathy Robinson [cathyar@hawaii.rr.com]

Sent: Friday, March 30, 2012 2:15 PM

To: JUDtestimony

Dear House Committee on Judiciary: Chair Keith-Agaran, Vice Chair Karl Rhoads, and all Members:

Please vote no, and urge the other members of the Judiciary Committee to vote no, categorically, on HCR 114, "APPLYING TO CONGRESS TO CALL A NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE V OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION."

1. Have we all forgotten the incident in China's Tienanmen Square and the image of the lone courageous student protesting the imperial bullying of his government that day in May just a few years ago? This is what the Second Amendment to the Constitution is all about! That poor student wouldn't have been in that position if the Chinese people were as armed as their government is! Their government wouldn't dared have pushed its people to this if they had been!

I'm sure you all are (too?) familiar with Thomas Jefferson's comment that "When the people fear their government, there is tyranny; when the government fears the people, there is liberty"? Is that just a rhetorical question to you?

That anyone sane can possibly imagine that taking private firearms from citizens makes us all "safer" is just being ignorant and stupid! Ignorant of the facts that statistics prove over and over again that private firearms STOP more potential crimes than all the "law enforcement" put together! This Con-Con proposal is predicated on the fallacious and emotion-based premise that the miniscule few incidents of private abuse of firearms to commit crimes or accidental injury or death justifies banning or severely restricting private possession of all firearms! This is madness! Stupid because common experience belies the frequency and severity of even the most heinous firearms crimes, while abuses of their power and firearms and military tactics by domestic law enforcement mounts every day.

You could all do your own easy research on these facts and figures if you would. Why don't you? You don't need someone to spoon-feed you; it's all instantly available to each of you right there at your fingertips poised over your computer keyboards or iPods! To pretend to be ignorant and unable to get the facts and figures you need is to simply laugh in the faces of your constituents. Shameful.

How about instead we de-glorify war, stop the stupid, costly, and counter-productive "war on drugs," and this constantly pitting us against each other? Remove the motivation for acting out in society first. Government has no business in what people choose to do with or put in their own bodies. And it has no business seeking to disarm those whose freedoms it presumes to "protect."

We don't need a Con-Con; we need to respect our natural rights as specifically enshrined and protected in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Period.

HCR 114 NO!

To repeal or modify in any way the Second Amendment so as to restrict the protection and use of private firearms will produce exactly what this ill-conceived HCR seeks to circumvent: it will precipitate an armed rebellion. Only here in Hawaii could anyone imagine that the citizenry will just roll over and allow politicians to trample on them. (And I think even here in Hawaii to do that is to badly overestimate the docility of the citizenry.) It is against human reason; it is inciteful; it is unjust; it restricts timeless -- and independent of any Constitution! -- human rights. It is tyrannical, and it is wrong.

2. What business is it of any government to coerce anyone to have any medical attention or insurance whatsoever?! We wouldn't have the "problems" the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ostensibly seeks to solve if people were FREE to choose whatever they wanted -- and FREE to choose NOT to have any medical insurance at all! Whose RIGHTFUL business is it to say who should and who should not have any medical care and/or any medical insurance? Whose? Who appointed the President, or Congress, or Governor, or Legislature, to decide for everyone else what they must or must not have or do?! WHO?

Get government out of the medical business, and out of the insurance business, out of the professional and business permitting and licensing business, and let people make their OWN choices. Insurance companies don't need government approval or regulation. Insurance companies need regulation by each person's own individual choices. They will either succeed by meeting their customers' needs and wants, or lose customers and thereby fail. That is as it should be. Period. Government is neither doctor, nurse, pharmacist, insurance guru, or business CEO. And it certainly isn't the Great Supreme Being! Get out of it all and let THE PEOPLE decide for themselves individually what they believe is best for them.

"Declaring" anything "Constitutional" -- especially if you have to modify the Constitution to be able to do that to begin with! Sheesh! Cart before horse? -- doesn't make it "Constitutional," or right, or just, or good. Stop playing with our lives through stupid tricks and semantics!

3. KEEP the supermajority for cloture! We need LESS "laws" passed, and MORE delaying and killing measures applied to every one of them! We wouldn't be in this mess today if we had MORE supermajority requirements and more filibusters of asinine "legislation"!!

To agree with this resolution to Con-Con is to admit you want to control us; you know better than any of us poor stupid beasts out here what is good for us; you think you have a right to rule just because you were "elected" to your position of power! You reveal your heart, if you pass this HCR, which goes far beyond anything old King Georges ever imagined for his throne!

4. I doubt that any of the introducers or co-sponsors of this dangerous HCR would be hankering for eliminating the electoral college if their guy Gore had "won" in 2000 rather than Bush.

That's all this is about: power and control over the people. Why, with Gore we'd already be flat broke and worshiping all the trees and bugs and sacrificing our lives for theirs, as the human virus of the planet that has to be de-populated down to the "manageable" size of no more than 500,000,000 individuals.

HCR 114 NO!

How about we all admit that all the laws NECESSARY were already enshrined in the Constitution and Bill of Rights, and everything that's come to pound us since has been superfluous, frivolous, trite, unnecessary, oppressive, dangerous, and lethal to our rights, our freedoms, and our very lives? We REALLY need YET MORE?! Ah, yes; the job of bringing us to heel isn't quite complete yet.

Is that what you believe? That we NEED more laws, that we NEED absolute control over our poor lives by our dear rulers -- which, of course, includes all of you? If you pass this HCR, that is what you will be saying, categorically.

How about we concentrate on rolling back everything TO the original enumerated limitations of the Constitution -- and then making one last amendment to make it impossible to ever exceed it again? That's the ONLY Con-Con we should ever consider!

Please vote NO! on this dangerous and anti-human resolution. Please. If you really have us citizens at heart.

Thank you for your time and kind consideration.

Catherine Robinson
94-445 Alapine St.
Waipahu, HI 96797-4504